1: Roth--83 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 619, 721

"Of their inter-tribal wars, and the causes thereof, we have necessarily only the merest accounts. The Van Diemen's Land Annual (1834, p. 80) says: 'They were perpetually engaged in conflicts between rival tribes, and we are told that these were frequently attended by fatal issues.... Some of these tribes are infinitely more savage... than others, and more skilled in the arts of war,' and Milligan (Beacon, p. 26), 'The numerous tribes of which the population of the island consisted were constantly at war with one another.' Davis reports similarly (p. 419): 'Each tribe occupied certain tracts of country, but they were constantly invading and at war with each other.' But of course they were not always at war with each other, as Kelly's statement proves, 'The natives far to the southward and westward take no part with the natives in the interior; those on the northern and eastern coasts do not take part with the tribes in the interior' (Kelly, p. 51). According to G. Robertson (ibid. pp. 47-48), the Oyster Bay mob were exterminated by the Port Dalrymple natives. The Oyster Bay and Big River tribes were hostile to the northern natives' (ibid). Of the cause of these wars we have not far to look, the chief cause being probably the pressing presence of the Colonists,..."

1: Roth--83 [2] (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 177, 619, 721

"... Melville (p. 349) states: 'Ever after the arrival of the English, they were at war with each other--tribe against tribe; and this was owing to their having been forced to trespass on each other's hunting-grounds, being driven from their own by the white population.' West, the historian, also ascribes the inter-tribal wars to this cause (II. p. 85). 'The wars among them latterly, provoked by driving one tribe on the boundaries of another, were not infrequent; as everywhere, women were the cause and object of strife .... Those [tribes] on the east of the Launceston Road were confederate. Towards the last, the Oyster Bay tribe committed their children to the care of the Big River tribe, many of whom had been slain by the Western tribes, as well as by the English.'"

1: Roth--83-84
116, 619, 721

(No date) 1890

Tasmanians

"Calder, who has gone through Robinson's voluminous reports, speaking of their internecine wars, says (Journ. pp. 24-25): 'Animosities ran high amongst them, and their quarrels never died out except with the extinction of their enemies. They made [84] long marches to surprise them; and to come on them unperceived, if possible, was their constant object. But it was most difficult to approach them thus, the greatest circumspection being necessary, for such was their vigilance, that it was rare to catch them off their guard.... There seems to have been an hereditary feud between the men of the east and the west, and whenever their captor, Robinson, met them, they were either on the march to meet their ancient enemies, or were returning from a victory; for I do not recollect a single instance in which they ever acknowledged defeat. Their march was described to me as a very regular one, and that they stepped pretty well together, singing or shouting some war-chant, and rattling their spears as they went along, striking the ground with great force with the foot every third or fourth step. The look of each was determined and ferocious beyond expression,' and on p. 27: 'The Big River and Oyster Bay tribes and the Stoney Creek tribe were the most ferocious and predatory of all the natives.'"

116, 609, 619, 726

"The following account by Calder, compiled from the sources already mentioned, gives the best conception of the [88] methods and tactics adopted by the aborigines in their final struggle with the Europeans. This account appears in the Journ. Anth. Inst. 1873, pp. 7-11, and we supplement it by important extracts from other sources. 'Tribal dissensions, causing mutual destruction (for such were their jealousies and hatreds, that they fought one another all the time they were thrashing the whites), contributed to their decrease in some degree.... Beyond all doubt, they [the settlers] were no match for the blacks in bush-fighting, either in defensive or offensive operations.... If it had been possible to bring the savage into fair and open fighting with something like equal numbers, this would have been reversed. But the black assailant was far too acute and crafty an enemy to be betrayed into this style of contest, and never fought till he knew he had his opponents at a disadvantage to themselves. He waited and watched for his opportunity for hours, and often for days, and when the proper moment arrived, he attacked the solitary hut of the stock-keeper, or the hapless traveller whom he met in the bush, with irresistable numbers, taking life generally singly, but often; the largest number I read of his destroying on one occasion being four persons. In these assaults on the dwellings of his enemy he contrived his attacks so cleverly as to insure success at least five times in six, and if forced to abandon his enterprise, his retreat, with few exceptions, was a

bloodless one. The natives so managed their advance on the point of attack as not to be seen until they were almost close to the dwelling of their victim. They distinguished between a house and a hut, and seldom approached the former.... They never attacked except in parties of twenty, fifty, a hundred, or even greater numbers. Their mode of assaulting a dwelling when there were several inmates at home, which they knew by previous watching, was to divide into small gangs of five, ten, or more, each concealing itself,... their approach being so quiet as to create no suspicion of their presence, to which the woody and uneven nature of the country is eminently favourable. Then one of these parties, which was prepared for instant retreat, made its presence known, either by setting fire to some shed or bush fence, or by sending a flight of spears in at the window, shouting their well-known war-whoop at the same time. This never failed of bringing out the occupants, who, seeing the authors of the outrage, now at a safe distance, but in an attitude of defiance, incautiously pursued them.... The blacks then retreated just as quickly as the others advanced, keeping out of gunshot, and [89] defying them, generally in good English, to come on.... Having decoyed their pursuers to a safe distance into the woods, and generally with rising ground between them and the hut, the others sprang from their cover, and rushing into the place, plundered it of its contents, often finishing their work by burning it to its foundations; first, however, killing or leaving for dead, any unfortunate persons--mostly a mother and her children--who

chanced to be left behind. They then fled with their booty, reuniting with the decoy party at some distant point. In their first systematized assaults... their principal object was murder, but in later times, plunder.... They took everything that was useful, and often what was of no use at all to them,... such, for example, as clocks, workboxes, etc .... But provisions of all sorts, and, above all, blankets, firearms, and ammunition, were the articles they prized most; of which latter they eventually surrendered many stand to the Government, pistols, muskets, fowling-pieces, powder and ball, all perfectly clean and dry, and in excellen order. Of these latter it was found that they knew not only the use, but were also practised in using them; but there is no instance of their bringing them into the field, though they afterwards assured Mr. Robinson that they meant to have done so, but to the last they seem to have preferred their own arms in both fight and chase--namely, the spear and waddy.... Notwithstanding the ancient customs of the blacks, not to permit the women to take any part in active war, these individuals could not be restrained from joining in and sometimes leading the attack. One of these persons, ... a woman of one of the East Coast tribes, ... planned and executed nearly every outrage that was committed in the districts bordering on the north and northwestern coast. In the days of their decay, she collected the poor remnants of several tribes into one hostile band, of whom she was the leader and chieftainess.'"

1: Roth-119 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 221, 361, 619

"From Fourneaux's account it did not seem that they moved in large numbers; but Prinsep (p. 78) says: 'They move in large bodies, with incredible swiftness, forty or fifty miles in one night.' This statement contradicts that of Widowson, as regards travelling at night; but as regards numbers agrees with O'Connor (p. 54), who says they 'travel in parties of ten, twenty, and thirty.' 'Though they rarely remain two days in a place, they seldom travel far at a time. Each tribe keeps much to its own district' (Backhouse, p. 104). We have seen above that Melville also says they keep within their boundaries; but both statements appear to contradict the reasons usually described as the cause of their intertribal feuds."

116, 197, 619

"'The circumstance of the aboriginal inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land being divided into many tribes and subtribes, in a state of perpetual antagonism and open hostility to each other, materially added to the number... of the elements and agents of mutation ordinarily operating on the language of an unlettered people: to this was superadded the effect of certain superstitious customs everywhere prevalent, which led from time to time to the absolute rejection and disuse of words previously employed to express objects familiar and indispensable to all, thus... tending arbitrarily to diversify the dialects of several tribes. The habit of gesticulation, and the use of signs to eke out the meaning of monosyllabic expressions, and to give force, precision, and character to vocal sounds, exerted a further modifying effect, producing, as it did, carelessness and laxity of articulation, and in the application and pronunciation of words. The last-named irregularity, namely, the distinctly different pronunciation of a word by the same person on different occasions, to convey the same idea, is very perplexing, [177] until the radical or essential part of the word, apart from prefixes and suffixes, is caught hold of. The affixes, which signify nothing, are la, lah, le, leh, leah, na, ne, nah, ba, be, beah, bo, ma, me, meah, pa, poo, ra, re, ta, te, ak, ek, ik, etc. (1) Some early voyagers

---

"1. As will be shown, Milligan was not quite correct here, for some of these suffixes had pronominal and other meanings."

appear to have mistaken the terminals la, le, etc., as distinction of sex when applied to men, women, and the lower animals. The language, when spoken by the natives, was rendered embarassing by the frequent alliteration of vowels and other startling abbreviations, as well as by the apposition of the incidental increment indifferently before or after the radical or essential constituent of words. To defects in orthoepy the aborigines added shortcomings in syntax, for they observed no settled order or arrangement of words in the construction of their sentences, but conveyed in a supplementary fashion by tone, manner, and gesture, those modifications of meaning which we express by mood, tense, number etc. ... Barbarous tribes, living in isolated positions, antagonistic... to each other, would each, within its own sphere, yield to various influences, calculated to modify language, and to confirm as well as to create dissimilarity.... Rude, savage people often adopt the most arbitrary and unmeaning sounds through caprice or accident, to represent ideas, in place of words previously in use; a source of mutation, as respects the various dialects spoken amongst the aborigines of Van Diemen's Land, fertile in proportion to the number of tribes into which they were divided, and the ceaseless feuds which separated them from one another. Hence it was that the numberous tribes of Tasmanian aborigines were found possessed of distinct dialects, each different in many

particulars from every other. (2)"

"2. [See following sheet for footnote 2.]"

116, 197, 619

"2. [Footnote pp. 177-178] La Billardière (II. ch. xi. p. 73) states, that the words they learned from one tribe were found in communicating with others, but it must be remembered that the people he met with were all more or less in one district. Davies confirms Milligan as regards the inability of the eastward and westward tribes to understand each other when brought together at Flinders Island, and so does Dixon (II. p. 22). Jorgensen says (Tasm. Journ. I.), 'Those who are not of the same tribe appear to converse in broken English.' That the dialects are all of the same language does not admit of a doubt. This is proved by the numberous similar words expressing the same object found throughout the vocabularies. A [178] good example, showing the affinity of construction of the dialects spoken, can by made up from Milligan's vocabulary, thus:

English.	Oyster Bay and Pitwater Tribes	Mount Royal and Bruni Island, Recherche Bay, and South Tasmanian Tribes.
eye	mongtena	nubre or nubrenah
eyelash	mongtalinna	nubre tongany
eyelid	moygta genna	nubre wurrine
to see	mongtone	nubratone
dizzy (faint)	mongtantiack	nubretanyte"